

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 have been amended to further clarify the invention. Claims 23, 24, and 27-33 have been canceled. Claims 1-10, 12-21, and 25-26 remain pending in the application.

**FINALITY OF THE OUTSTANDING OFFICE ACTION**

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the finality of the outstanding Office Action because it includes new grounds for rejection that were not necessitated by amendment. Section 706.07(a) of the MPEP provides, in relevant part, that "second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c)."

The MPEP thus requires that a second Office Action be non-final if at least a single ground of rejection is introduced by the Examiner and such introduction is not necessitated by amendment or based on a new referenced introduced by the applicant after issuance of a first office action on the merits. The Examiner introduced at least one new ground for rejection in the final Office Action. Specifically, those new grounds for rejection include the obviousness rejection of claims 7-8 and 25-26, which were originally rejected under anticipation grounds. Because those claims have not been amended and no Information Disclosure Statement has been filed after issuance of the first Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the second Official Action should not be final. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request a third Office Action on the merits be issued by the USPTO to respond to the present Amendment.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-10, 12-21, AND 25-26**

Applicants address only the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-21, and 25-26 because the rejection of all other claims are now moot in view of the amendments introduced in the prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-8, 12-21, and 25-26 as being rendered obvious by the combination of Goldsmit and Gupta.

Regarding claim 1, as amended, the Examiner appears to assert that Goldsmit discloses the service objects recited in the claim and that Gupta discloses the recited business objects. Obviousness requires that the combination of references teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims being examined. Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 1 because the combination of Goldsmith and Gupta fails to teach or suggest (1) the instantiation of both business objects and service objects in a client computer system (e.g., Gupta only discloses processes in a server computer system); and (2) the association of business objects with a service object, also taking place in the client computer system, as required claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4 should be allowed at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 7, 12, 17, 25 and 26 should be allowed at least for the same reasons set forth above in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claim 8 should be allowed at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 7.

Claims 13-16 should be allowed at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 12.

Claims 18-21 should be allowed at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 17.

The Examiner also rejected claims 5-6 and 9-10 as being rendered obvious by the combination of Goldsmith, Gupta, and Pandit.

Applicants respectfully submit that like Goldsmith and Gupta, Pandit fails to disclose (1) the instantiation of both business objects and service objects in a client computer system; and (2) the association of business objects with a service object, also taking place in the client computer system. Because those two elements are incorporated by reference into each of claims 5-6 and

9-10, Pandit fails to cure the deficiencies of the Goldsmith-Gupta combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of those claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants earnestly solicit the expedited allowance of the pending claims. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper, or credit any overpayment of fees to deposit account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,



By: \_\_\_\_\_

Rafael A. Perez-Pineiro, Esq.  
Reg. No. 46,041  
Phone No. (914) 945-2631

IBM Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Dept.  
P. O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598